

# *Appendices*

# *Library Project Planning Meeting*

## *Tentative Agenda*

---

1. Introduce Meeting Participants
2. Review Purpose of Meeting
  - Identify Source of Subgrant Funds
  - Discuss Community Need in Relationship to Subgrant Funding Categories
  - Present Overview of Project Concept
  - Describe Stakeholder Evaluation Process
  - Summarize Efforts to Date
3. Describe the Proposed Project
  - Goal and Objectives
  - Activities
  - Budget
  - Evaluation
4. Discuss and Complete Project Evaluation Worksheet
5. Determine On-Going Role for Meeting Participants
6. Schedule Next Meeting Date
7. Adjournment

# Data Collection Methods

<i>Methods</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<b>Existing Records</b>  (e.g., registration materials, financial records, usage counts)	The library staff may already be collecting information through the normal procedures of the library. By modifying current procedures or simply examining the data in a different way, the library staff may be able to answer some of the key evaluation questions.	Provides quantifiable evidence of activities and results.  Requires minimum time, effort, and money.	Analysis can be complicated.  Data can be misleading if originally collected for different purpose.  Usually reflects quantity, not quality.
<b>Observation</b>  (e.g., structured participation, casual conversation, counting session attendance)	The library staff or designated program participants may be able to look for specific data in a consistent way that will help to answer the evaluation questions. The observer, through informal interviews or other means, could focus on such aspects of the project as project setting, nature of interactions, program activities, library user behaviors, informal interactions, unplanned activities, and unexpected behavior.	Requires minimum interruption to program activities.  Provides check on reports of staff and users.  Provides context for understanding other data.	Observer must be skilled in process observation.  Observer filters data through individual perspective and values.  Program participants may not be open and natural.

<i>Methods</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<b>Individual Interviews</b>  (e.g., structured interviews with individual participants, face-to-face or by phone)	The library staff may develop structured questions for interviews with key people. The interviews with individuals should consist of a series of questions designed to provide the specific information needed. The interview can be conducted face-to-face or by telephone. Designing effective questions and conducting a good interview is not an easy task and may require an experienced interviewer.	Can probe for meaning of responses.  May create participant willingness to disclose sensitive information.  Can control when and how questions are asked.	Time consuming.  Analysis may be difficult.  Requires skilled interviewer.  Some participants may feel threatened.
<b>Group Interviews</b>  (e.g., focus groups, nominal groups, work groups)	The library staff may collect information from small groups of people. A focus group (8-12 persons) is used when group interaction is likely to increase the quality of the data being collected. If possible, the group should be led by a skilled group facilitator and another person should document comments of group members, the consensus of the group on specific issues, and any observations about group member interactions.	Stimulates thinking and sharing ideas.  Can get different views on same subject.  Can get consensus about a program.	Cannot be confidential.  May be difficult to organize.  Some participants may feel threatened.  Requires skilled group interviewer.

## *Data Collection Methods* (Continued)

<i>Methods</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<b>Journals/Logs</b>  (e.g., participants self-reports and critiques of experience)	The library staff could be asked to keep a record of anecdotes, observations, personal reactions, comments, and the frequency of specific activities relating to the project. The purpose of using this method is to understand the experience of the program from the participant's point of view. The information collected, however, will be subjective and may be difficult to analyze.	Provides record of immediate reaction to events.  Provides record of change over time.  Requires minimum effort to collect data.  Provides record of unanticipated events.	Data is subjective and not as reliable.  Can be difficult to analyze.  Participants must be trained in how to record information.
<b>Questionnaire Surveys</b>  (e.g., systematic data collection instruments: paper and pencil, telephone, computer)	The library staff can use questionnaires in obtaining information from a large number of individuals. The nature of the information to be collected should be easily categorized. Surveys may be mailed or hand-delivered, person-to-person, or telephone surveys. Questionnaires that collect accurate data are not simple to design and administer. One may wish to use an experienced individual in designing the survey. Time should be taken to obtain feedback from stakeholders and a few people in the target population should test the survey before finalizing.	Can collect data from large number of people in short time.  Relatively inexpensive.  Can be confidential.  Provides ease of analysis and summarizing of data.	Data is restricted by the questions that are asked.  Substantial planning time is required.  Return rates can be quite low.

<i>Methods</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<b>Expert Opinion</b>  (e.g., panel of library directors)	The library staff may contact people who are knowledgeable because of their experience and expertise in the content or process of the project that is being evaluated. These people could be national experts, university faculty, or directors of successful programs in other libraries. Such persons can help assess the needs for new projects and programs; react to the quality of existing or planned programs; and suggest ways to improve programs. This expert opinion can be gathered through direct contacts with the individuals or through a review of reports and articles that they have written.	Is relatively simple to design and inexpensive to implement.  Strengthens lines of communication between experts and participants.  Brings visibility to project.	Experts may not be available for this.  May be difficult to find neutral experts.  Participants may not be directly familiar with program.

## *Bibliography*

---

- Bond, S.L., Boyd, S.E., & Rapp, K.A. (1997). *Taking Stock: A practical guide to evaluating your own programs*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Horizon Research, Inc.
- Brinkerhoff, R.O., Dale M. Brethower, Terry Hluchyj, and Jeri Ridings Nowakowski, *Program Evaluation*, Hingham, Massachusetts, Kluwer Nijhoff Publishing, 1983.
- Fink, A. & Kosecoff, J. *How to Conduct Surveys: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage, 1988.
- Gray, S.T. & Assoc. (1998). *Evaluation with Power*. San Francisco.: Jossey-Bass.
- McClure, C.R., *Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1987.
- Measuring Program Outcomes: A practical approach*. (1996). Alexandria, VA.: United Way of America
- Patton, M.Q. *Creative Evaluation*. Newbury Park, California: Sage, 1987.
- Patton, M.Q. *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. Newbury Park, California: Sage, 1987.
- Rosenberg, P. *Cost Finding for Public Libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1985.
- Schalock, R.L. (1995). *Outcome-based Evaluation*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Singleton, R., Straits, B.C., Straits, M.M., & McAllister, R.J. *Approaches to Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Tice, K.E. & Gill, S.J. Education Information Centers: An Evaluation. *Journal of Career Development*, Vol. 18(1), Fall 1991, pp. 37-50.
- Turock, B.J. *Library Programs: Evaluating Federally Funded Public Library Programs*. U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1990.
- Van House, N.A., Lynch, M.J., McClure, C.R., Zweizig, D.L., & Rodger, E.J. *Output Measures for Public Libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1987.
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation *Evaluation Handbook*. (1998). Battle Creek, MI: The W.K. Kellogg Foundation

## *Additional Roles for Stakeholders*

In addition to the role that stakeholders will play in identifying evaluation questions, data resources and data collection methods, individual members of the stakeholder group or a smaller advisory committee may serve in the following roles:

- ♦ Function as a Planning Committee
- ♦ Develop evaluation instruments
- ♦ Pilot test evaluation instruments
- ♦ Assist in evaluation implementation and data collection
- ♦ Provide “reality checks”
- ♦ Participate in project promotion
- ♦ Assist with problem solving for the project
- ♦ Provide interim evaluation analysis and advice on project revision
- ♦ Pursue future project funding
- ♦ Assess long-term effects or impact of the project
- ♦ Identify needs and propose future projects for consideration
- ♦ Provide a cadre of individuals which may be called upon to serve on the library board, friends group or ad hoc committees

# Glossary

## Evaluation

A method or methods of measuring the level of success of a project based on the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative information. Evaluations should answer the questions “so what?” or “what difference did the project make?”

## Funding Areas

LSTA project categories which are eligible for LSTA funding. Specific funding areas are designated by the Library of Michigan as being active for each fiscal year.

## Goal

A general statement which describes the project’s broad overall intent.

## Methods

Statements describing how project objectives will be accomplished.

## Objectives

Specific statements identifying what will be achieved during the life of the project. Each objective must be directly related to the project goal and will, ideally, be expressed in measurable terms.

## Stakeholder

An individual who has a significant concern or “stake” in the success of the project being evaluated, e.g., teacher, city manager, library user.

The Library of Michigan is committed to the effective evaluation of LSTA projects. This has been reflected by encouraging LSTA applicants to use the stakeholder evaluation method. The Library of Michigan participated in the national Evaluating Library Programs and Services project, coordinated by the University of Wisconsin-Madison. This project developed the Tell-It model of evaluating library programs. Tell-It is similar to the stakeholder approach, however, it presents a broader framework for evaluation.